

## Oral submitters: 22 and 25 November

### Additional documents

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Page number</b>
Adam Flowers	Urban Environment Professionals	1
Sandra Aikin		5
Richard Burrell		8
Mike Mellor	Living Streets Aotearoa	10
Katherine Wilson and Melissa McGhie	Property Council New Zealand	13
Brian Hasell		17
John Gray		20
Carole Inkster		23

## **Te Ngākau Precinct Urban Environment Professionals Submission**

We, the undersigned, are a group of urban environment design professionals with knowledge of Wellington and Te Ngākau. We cover the broad spectrum of expertise including architecture, landscape architecture and urban design. Many of us have a long history of assisting Council with the design of public projects.

While recognising the complexities of the project, the opportunities for change and enhancement, and acknowledging work of the project team, we have concerns about the appropriateness of the proposals described in Council's consultation document and the process used to produce these.

### **We are concerned about the following:**

1. Loss of the unique positive qualities of Civic Square and the City-to-Sea Bridge and replacement of these iconic public spaces with a new environment that appears generic with little civic and public quality.
2. Response to the wider city including Te Ngākau's place in the hierarchy of city centre public open spaces, broader circulation patterns and the geometry of city and waterfront.
3. Relationship to the context, including whenua/moana (land/ocean) is a fundamental aspect of urban design and should be a given. However, the natural world is rendered in a manner that is superficial and conventional and does not construct a memorable narrative for Te Ngākau. This has led to an unstructured landscape which does not appear to support either civic functions or park-like activities.
4. An at-grade landscape response that removes the enclosed nature of the square, allowing the space to bleed out towards the lagoon, while allowing the vehicle activity of Jervis Quay into the square without any mitigating design approach.
5. The proposed pedestrian bridge that - in its current form - offers little public amenity and impacts the popular and well-used lawn beside the Wellington Free Ambulance building.
6. The filling in of approximately a third of the Whairepo Lagoon and consequent loss of both character, and functionality for waka, dragon boats and rowing shells.
7. The proposition to demolish the Michael Fowler Centre and replace it with commercial activity. Removal of this iconic building and venue risks undermining the civic and cultural function of Te Ngākau and signalling that Wellington has relinquished any claim to be the nation's cultural capital.

8. An accelerated design process that has up to this point been short on meaningful stakeholder and public engagement.
9. Scenarios for consultation being binary opposites: (a) two 'new bridge' or 'no-bridge' scenarios that focus on the quantity rather than quality of open space and (b) excessive commercialisation of what is intended to be the 'beating heart of the city', which with demolition of the Michael Fowler Centre reduces Te Ngākau's civic and cultural function.

**We support:**

1. The importance of a process and response that is developed with mana whenua but that integrates greater consideration of spatial quality and amenity;
2. The intention to introduce additional trees and references to the natural environment into the Wellington cityscape. Likewise, the intention to improve the landscape response within Te Ngākau, but in a manner that is more responsive to civic activities and amenity; and
3. An appropriately scaled building to define and activate the north-east corner of the precinct. We consider that the eleven-storey structure shown with Scenario 3 is excessively tall and would cast deep shade over the space.
4. A new building of appropriate scale and use on the MOB/CAB site. This should frame the gateway to Te Ngākau from the city, and activate, enliven and define the open space of the precinct.

**We request:**

1. That Council reconsider the scenarios and explore alternative approaches including permutations of some of those described in the background Precinct Wide Draft Development Plan.
2. That a realistic option to retain the City-to-Sea Bridge is developed.
3. That, given the project's public importance, there is greater visibility of options and public input into decision-making at each stage of the process. This transparency and the robustness of the outcome relies on timely and robust stakeholder and participatory design processes including:
  - a potential citizen reference group and/or public symposia/workshops to comment on directions, values and give feedback;
  - a broad expert professional reference group for review and as an independent sounding board on design opportunities and approaches.
4. A strengthened relationship to the public waterfront to enhance both the waterfront public realm and provide the necessary connections.

We also request the opportunity to present to Council as a group.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Profession/Role</i>	<i>Company (if applicable)</i>
Adam Flowers	Director	CCM Architects Ltd
Andrew Burns	Urban Designer	McIndoe Urban
Andrew Irving	Architect & Director	Irving Smith Architects Ltd
Anne Kelly	Architect	a.k.a. Architecture
Ashley Cox	Principal	Ashley Cox Architect
Callum McKenzie	Principal	McKenzie Higham Architects
Charles Gordon	Landscape Architect	Days Bay Design
Cheryl Robilliard	Landscape Architect	PAOS
Chris Cochran	Conservation Architect	The Wedge
Dr. Chris McDonald	Urban Designer	McIndoe Urban
Christina van Bohemen	NZIA President 2016 —2018 Architect	Sills van Bohemen Architects
Craig Burt	Architect / Director	Parsonson Architects
Craig Moller	Director	Moller Architects
David Kernohan	Architect (Ret.)	Architecture Diagnostics
Deyana Popova	Urban Designer	Urban Perspectives
Dr. Dorita Hannah	Performative Urbanist	Independent Designer/Theorist
Esekia Faiga	Director	Pou Architecture
Dr. Frank Stoks	Architect (Ret.) CPTED specialist	Stoks Limited
Gary Edridge	Architect	Re-design Architects
Gerald Parsonson	Architect / Director	Parsonson Architects
Gordon Moller ONZM	NZIA President 2003 —2006 Director	Moller Architects
Graeme McIndoe	Architect and Urban Designer	McIndoe Urban
Guy Cleverley	Director	CCM Architects Ltd
Ian Bowman	Principal	Ian Bowman Architect and Conservator
Ian Pike	Former Wellington Waterfront CEO	
Ian Stantiall	Director	Stantiall Studio
Jane Black	Urban Planner	People + Places
John Daish	Architect (Ret.)	
John Hardwick-Smith	Principal	Athfield Architects
John Melhuish	Director	Herriot Melhuish O’Neill Architects
John McIntyre	Principal	Athfield Architects
Jon Rennie	Principal	Athfield Architects
John Hunt	Emeritus Professor of Architecture	University of Auckland

*Continued.*

Karl Wipatene	Architect	a.k.a Architecture
Ken Davis	Architect/Director	Ken Davis Architects
Marc Bailey	Partner	Boffa Miskell Ltd
Mary Daish	Architect	Mary Daish Architect
Matt Wenden	Urban Designer	McIndoe Urban
Maurice Pipson	Architect, Senior Associate	Tennent Brown Architects
Max Herriot	Director	Herriot Melhuish O'Neill Architects
Assoc. Prof. Michael Donn	Centre for Building Performance Research	Wellington School of Architecture Victoria University of Wellington
Michael O'Brien	Director	Ignite Architects
Nick Barratt-Boyes	Founding Director / Managing Director	Studio of Pacific Architecture
Nick Bevin	Architect (Ret.) Distinguished Fellow of the NZIA	
Nicole Thompson	Principal	Wraight + Associates
Dr. Nigel Isaacs	Senior Lecturer Building Science	Wellington School of Architecture Victoria University of Wellington
Dr. Peter Parkes	Architect	Strategic Architecture
Ralph Johns	Director	Isthmus
Ric Slessor	Architect	Slessor Architects
Robin Simpson	Urban Designer	Robin Simpson Design
Roger Shand	Architect	Shand Shelton
Russell Murray	Conservation Architect ANZIA	
Sally Apthorp	Architect	
Sally Ogle	Architect	Patchwork Architecture
Sam Donald	Architect/Associate	Parsonson Architects Ltd.
Dr. Sam Kebbell	Director	KebbellDaish Architects Ltd
Sharon Jansen	Architect	
Sophie Jacques	Associate Landscape Architect	Isthmus
Stephen McDougall	Founding Director	Studio of Pacific Architecture
Steve Dunn	NZILA Registered Landscape Architect	
Steven Lloyd	Architect	Steven Lloyd Architecture Ltd
Stuart Dun	Principal/ Urban Design and Landscape Lead	Studio of Pacific Architecture

**Q1 Full name**

Short Text Sandra Wendy Aikin

**Q2 Are you are making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?**

Select Box Individual

**Q3 Please enter the name of the organisation you are submitting on behalf of.**

Short Text

**Q4 What is your connection to Wellington?**

Multi Choice I am a Wellington City Council ratepayer  
I live in Wellington

**Q5 Optional: Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an oral hearing?**

Select Box Yes

**Q6 Please leave a phone number for us to arrange the oral hearing time with you.**

Number 0

**Q7 Please choose your preferred City to Sea Bridge scenario.**

Select Box I do not support either option

**Q8 If people want a new bridge, there are many things to think about when designing it. Whether you support building a bridge or not, we want to know what the most important things to consider are. Please choose up to three from the list below.**

Multi Choice  
Ensuring resilience and longevity  
Ensuring it's easy for everyone to use (accessibility)  
Adding places to sit and gather  
Adding public art and sculptures  
Lighting and safety after dark

**Q9 You chose 'Keeping the cost low and minimising impact on rates'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q10 You chose 'Ensuring resilience and longevity'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text  
I consider the information presented is already a fait accompli and there is insufficient information on the City to Sea Bridge.  
I am a seasoned overseas traveller and I have not seen a bridge as raw, natural and unique than our Wellington 'Bird' bridge. A fuller description can be found in Wikipedia. It has world-wide status. I always take my overseas visitors across the City to Sea Bridge and they, too, describe and enjoy the cultural and creativity aspects as exclusive and unexampled in their travels.  
Many of the aspects when designing a bridge are already evident in the City to Sea Bridge in places to sit and gather, viewing area, public art and culture.  
I thought that the costs and minimising impact on rates, ensuring resilience and longevity, ensuring it's easy for everyone to use, lighting and safety would be standard assurances and "the most important things to consider" for all aspects of the Council. The City to Sea Bridge already provides an environment that enhances New Zealand's culture.

**Q11 You chose 'Ensuring it's easy for everyone to use (accessibility)'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q12** You chose 'Adding places to sit and gather'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q13** You chose 'Including viewing areas'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q14** You chose 'Adding public art and sculptures'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q15** You chose 'Lighting and safety after dark'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q16** Do you have any other thoughts about the City to Sea Bridge or how people can move between Te Ngākau and the waterfront?

Long Text

The area being covered in this submission is relatively small. Currently the open space and current historic buildings bordering and leading to the City to Sea Bridge has had ample of activity. It is a place "Of the People, By the People, For the People" (Lincoln, The Gettysburg Address). It is one of the few historic sites and probably the only one, that the public can use. It represents the beating heart of Wellington. The Bridge already acts as a way of get to the waterfront; perhaps a lift or some mechanism which could assist disabled people to use it.

**Q17** Below are some potential scenarios for further development in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct. Please choose up to three that are most important to you.

Multi Choice

Keeping and restoring existing buildings  
Making open or green spaces better for people to use  
Improving cultural and creative opportunities in the space  
Lighting and safety after dark

**Q18** You chose 'Keeping and restoring existing buildings'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

We must maintain and enhance the Jacl Ilott Centre, library/art gallery, Michael Fowler Centre, Town Hall. The Council ahs already started to maintain most. They were all being used. It's good to upgrade them, earthquake proof, but changing them should not be a priority. It's a distraction from what should be Wellington's priority which continues to be its water problems.  
It's ironic that the Council says that maintenance and upgrading the City to Sea Bridge would "impact on traffic". Perhaps the Council has forgotten the "current impact on traffic" in Thorndown roadworks (anticipated to take at least six months); the cycle ways in Kilbirnie, Lyall Bay, Berhampore, Island just to name a few near my home.

**Q19** You chose 'Keeping or increasing the amount of open or green spaces'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q20** You chose 'Making open or green spaces better for people to use'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q21** You chose 'Adding spaces for hospitality, retail and other businesses'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q22** You chose 'Keeping overall costs as low as possible'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q23** You chose 'Improving cultural and creative opportunities in the space'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q24** You chose 'Lighting and safety after dark'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q25** If you chose to add something else, please tell us why you added this.

Long Text

**Q26** Below are some other potential design considerations for further development in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct. Please choose up to three that are most important to you.

Multi Choice

**Q27** Do you have any other thoughts about what we should be prioritising in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct?

Long Text

These aspects should be at the heart and form the infrastructure of the Council's work in design and place. I see no need for commercial buildings in this area; they would encroach, in this small section of Wellington, upon its heart and soul. This area is already being used for the benefit of the public, by the public, and for some of our most important cultural, creative and civic functions.

**Q28** If you have any supporting documents, please upload them here.

File Upload

**Q29** If you would like to receive a copy of your submission, please enter your email address below.

Email



## **Submission: Richard Burrell**

Dear All

Our Civic Square was Master planned by Sir Ian Athfield in conjunction with the local IWI, and today we have some 20 Artworks incorporated into the Civic Square and City to Sea Bridge (including the paving in the Square )

This important public space, was the first of its kind in New Zealand, where genuine participation in partnership between Iwi, Architects and Artists was carried out!

The Square is not broken only some of the buildings, Leave it alone!

We have 2 Separate buildings and vehicle access to the MFC

The Bridge

The Bridge is not connected to Capital E

The cities Engineers say the Bridge will not fall down in a major earthquake

The soil around the Bridge and Lagoon will liquefy and could lift up all the road in Jervois Quay and Cable st by 500-600mm

If the bridge is substantially damaged in an earthquake Ceres Demolition have confirmed it is 18 hours work for 2 of their machines to cut the bridge up with Shears and push into Lagoon

Capital E the building

Gut the interior out, and remove all partitions and services

Block up with Concrete blocks all door and window openings to Exterior walls

Pour 500mm layers of Flowable fill into the building using existing walls as formwork

Fill to underside of concrete roof walkway and create a solid concrete mass

## **Flowable Fill**

Firth Flowable Fill is a flowable mix that can be used as a substitute for conventional granular hardfill materials. It can be delivered by chute or pump, making it ideal for spaces with restricted access.

- A low-strength mix of sand, cement, flyash and water
- Can be placed into large areas directly by chute or pump
- Ideal for backfilling utility trenches, for structural fill under foundations or floor slabs, or filling disused storage tanks
- Mix can be adjusted to suit your requirements
- Compressive strengths of 1 - 2.5 MPa after 28 days

The Vehicle Access to the MFC

The Cities engineers have dealt with this and allowed to Strengthen the Access Way

I am available to present this to The Council

Regards

Richard

Kia ora

This submission is on behalf of Living Streets Aotearoa Wellington Branch.

**We strongly oppose demolition of the City to Sea Bridge on the following grounds:**

- 1. Pedestrian safety is disregarded, hence overall safety performance of the options has not been assessed**
- 2. Information in the consultation booklet about proposed options for crossing Jervois Quay is incomplete**
- 3. Some information online is inaccurate, misleading, or contradictory.**

In detail:

### **1. Pedestrian and overall safety**

Page 12 of the consultation document says "*For safety reasons, doing nothing is not an option.*" Ensuring that the proposed "doing somethings" increase safety therefore requires a comparison of outcomes between the proposed options and the status quo, in order to ensure that the former will actually be safer. A key proposed change from the status quo in both options is the proposed signalised crossing of Jervois Quay, replacing the existing pedestrian bridges and crossings (see comment in section 2 below), supplemented in option 2 by a much narrower bridge than the current City to Sea.

Such replacement of the bridge by a signalised crossing will increase the level of risk to people crossing the road: fully segregated pedestrian facilities are clearly safer than crossing a six-lane highway protected solely by traffic lights (the dimensions appear to be similar to the existing crossing at Queens Wharf, which is neither a pleasant or convenient crossing; and the lack of protection that traffic lights provide has been highlighted by a very recent pedestrian fatality in the CBD.) There are many mentions of earthquake safety aspects in the booklet (though they are not quantified in any way), but none at all of the pedestrian safety risks proposed to be created. The only relevant online information is in answer to a question asked at the panel meeting, which says:

*Currently we do not have the exact data or quantifiable risk in two different scenarios (based on some available information we had 4 non-fatal accident on Waterloo Quay involving a pedestrian in the last 10 years). However, we are committed to addressing any identified risks appropriately and as soon as practically possible. If we perceive that pedestrian crossings pose any risks to pedestrians, we will implement traffic calming measures to mitigate these risks.*

This lack of consideration for pedestrian safety is unacceptable. No analysis has been done; and sticking plaster will be applied if things turn out badly.

In the absence of any such analysis, both options are a leap into the unknown. Doing nothing may well in fact may well be the safest option - but on the basis of lack of information available online, nobody actually knows.

## 2. Incomplete information

Apart from the zero information about pedestrian safety discussed above, online answers to questions show that the Harris St bridge is also proposed for demolition and the crossings near the Cable/Jervois intersection reviewed for rationalisation. This would mean a reduction of crossing opportunities from three (two safely segregated, with the surface crossing having a large median to reduce crossing widths and facilitate pedestrian movement) to one (a very long crossing) perhaps plus another (a narrow bridge). This would be a significant reduction in pedestrian level of service in respect of both safety and convenience (the latter being hinted at on p14, where "*concentrating pedestrian movement across Jervois Quay*" is bizarrely seen as a benefit.)

## 3. Inaccurate, misleading, or contradictory information

### a) Inaccurate

There are repeated references to the bridge being earthquake prone (e.g. the first item in the summary on p13), with a regulatory requirement to fix this (e.g. the fifth item in that summary). But, as the Kestrel Seismic Risk Evaluation says (section 4) "*The City to Sea Bridge therefore cannot be determined to be earthquake prone*", since the relevant legislation specifically excludes bridges, and hence there is no such regulatory requirement. (Beca and Hoffcon, authors of two other reports online, appear to be as unfamiliar with the legislation as the consultation report's authors, since they both describe the bridge as an earthquake-prone building, which it is not and cannot be.)

It is said (p13) that the City to Sea Bridge, Capital E and the seawall are all interconnected, so all need to be strengthened. We understand that this is not in fact the case.

A minor error, but which shows a surprising lack of knowledge of the area: there is no "St John's Ambulance building", St John never having had a presence in the area.

### b) Misleading

There are repeated references to the proposed new crossing being safe, but unsaid is that it will be less safe in road safety terms than the status quo.

Option B is said to "further enhance pedestrian flow" (p15). That is the case in comparison with option A, but not with the status quo - there is no "further" about it.

### c) Contradictory

Option A (p14) is said to give "*greater priority to foot traffic*" (greater than to traffic, presumably - certainly not greater than the status quo, where foot traffic has absolute priority), implying that pedestrians will receive a higher level of service than traffic; answers to questions variously say that the traffic lights will "*minimize both the wait time for pedestrians and the impact on traffic flow*", or "*ensure the best outcomes for pedestrians while minimising the impact on the flow of the vehicular traffic*". These statements are mutually incompatible and contradictory: minimising pedestrian wait time means no waiting for traffic (as now), while minimising the

impact on traffic flow means no waiting for pedestrians (as now). Achieving both is easy with grade separation (as now), impossible with a surface crossing (as proposed).

These contradictions should be clearly and legibly resolved, not hand-waved away in this fashion.

### **Summary**

This project is not required by any regulations, and should proceed without consideration of all risks: without such analysis, there is a real risk created that tens of millions will be spent on making the city overall less safe. Neither WCC nor residents can afford that.

We would like to be heard in support of this submission.

Regards

Mike Mellor

on behalf of Living Streets Aotearoa Wellington Branch

# Property Council New Zealand

---

## Submission to Wellington City Council on Te Ngākau Precinct Development Plan Consultation

13 November 2024

**For more information and further queries, please contact**

Katherine Wilson  
Katherine@propertynz.co.nz  
0278708150

## Submission on Wellington City Council's Te Ngākau Precinct Development Plan Consultation.

### 1. Summary

- 1.1 Property Council Wellington Branch ("Property Council") welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Wellington City Council's ("WCC") Te Ngākau Precinct Development Plan Consultation ("Development Plan").
- 1.2 WCC has already committed \$65 million to address the Te Ngākau Precinct. Wellington requires strong leadership and direction. The Development Plan should favour the option that would best provide WCC return on their investment, by increasing the vibrancy and use of the facilities.

### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 At a high level, we recommend that WCC:
  - Adopt *Option 1 – Addition of a pedestrian crossing only*. However, this could be adopted on the proviso that investigation and negotiations into a new Sea Bridge occurs under *Scenario 3 – More commercial activity*; and
  - Adopt *Option 3 – More commercial activity*.

### 3. Introduction

- 3.1. Property Council is the leading not-for-profit advocate for New Zealand's most significant industry, property. Our organisational purpose is, "Together, shaping cities where communities thrive".
- 3.2. The property sector shapes New Zealand's social, economic and environmental fabric. Property Council advocates for the creation and retention of a well-designed, functional and sustainable built environment, in order to contribute to the overall prosperity and well-being of New Zealand.
- 3.3. Property Council is the collective voice of the property industry. Property is the third largest industry in Wellington. There are around \$223.6 billion in property assets across Wellington, with property providing a direct contribution to GDP of \$3.6 billion and employment for 24,820 Wellington residents.
- 3.4. We connect property professionals and represent the interests of 139 Wellington based member companies across the private, public and charitable sectors.
- 3.5. This document provides Property Council's feedback on the proposed changes to [Wellington City Council's Te Ngākau Precinct Development Plan Consultation](#). Comments and recommendations are provided on issues relevant to Property Council's members.

#### **4. City to Sea Bridge**

- 4.1. WCC is asking for feedback on whether the bridge is replaced with a pedestrian crossing or a pedestrian crossing and a new bridge. Funding for the proposed demolition of the bridge and a new pedestrian crossing is budgeted for in the existing 2024-2034 Long-term Plan. However, if a new bridge was the preferred option following public consultation, an estimated \$17 million (above the current \$65 million) would be required in a future Long-term Plan.
- 4.2. WCC's Long-term Plan 2024/25 saw average rates rises of 16.9 per cent (plus 1.6 per cent for the sludge levy). The business differential is 3.7 times the residential rates. On top of this, Greater Wellington Regional Council rates increased by 20.55 per cent. WCC cannot solely rely on rates and needs to secure private capital to unlock the City's vibrancy.
- 4.3. We do not support WCC spending an additional \$17 million for the Sea Bridge. However, we still believe that there is demand for a Sea Bridge and that this can be met through negotiations and partnership with the private sector to wholly or partially fund a new bridge via the sale of the Michael Fowler Centre site.
- 4.4. WCC must become strategic, develop a more coordinated approach in the Development Plan and investigate alternative revenue sources (i.e. private funding) than solely rates.
- 4.5. We recommend WCC adopt Option 1 – Addition of a pedestrian crossing only. However, this could be adopted on the proviso that investigation into a new bridge occurs under Scenario 3 – More commercial activity.

#### **5. Remaining parts of the precinct**

- 5.1. We strongly support scenario 3 – More commercial activity.
- 5.2. WCC has committed \$65 million to address the Te Ngākau Precinct. This consultation should investigate how to best get a return on their investment as well as looking at the wider context of Wellington.
- 5.3. For example, when considering whether to landscape Jack Illott Green, the consultation does not mention that WCC have already dedicated budget towards the redevelopment Frank Kitts Park which is directly across the road using the new pedestrian crossing. WCC should not be competing with their own assets that are across the road from one another. A new building would provide more vibrancy and provide WCC with a better return on investment with more people using the new and upgraded facilities.
- 5.4. A new building on the Michael Fowler Centre site would also offer significant cultural, commercial, residential and hospitality opportunities. It would not only create a new way to access towards Cuba Street, but would also be a 400m walk to Takina Wellington Convention Centre.



5.5. If the public would like to see a new Sea Bridge, WCC should investigate whether a partnership can be obtained with the design of the new building on the existing Michael Fowler Centre site to incorporate a new raised pedestrian bridge. This would be an alternative way to fund the Sea Bridge and would not result in Wellington ratepayers having to agree to an additional \$17 million of funding (on top of the current \$65 million).

## 6. Conclusion

- 6.1. We support *Option 1 - Addition of a pedestrian crossing only*. However, this could be adopted on the proviso that investigation and negotiations into a new Sea Bridge occurs under *Scenario 3 – More commercial activity*.
- 6.2. We strongly support scenario 3 – More commercial activity. Property Council advocates for the creation of a well-designed, functional and sustainable built environment. We believe that additional capital from the private sector is required to truly unlock the Te Ngākau Precinct and support WCCs \$65 million investment in the Long-term Plan.
- 6.3. Property Council members invest, own, and develop property in Wellington. We wish to thank WCC for the opportunity to submit on the Te Ngākau Precinct Development Plan Consultation. This gives our members a chance to have their say in the future of our city. **We also wish to be heard in support of our submission.**
- 6.4. Any further enquires do not hesitate to contact Katherine Wilson, Head of Advocacy, via email: [katherine@propertynz.co.nz](mailto:katherine@propertynz.co.nz) or cell: 0278708150.

Yours Sincerely,



Melissa McGhie  
Wellington Committee Chair  
Property Council New Zealand

Response No:  
1

Contribution ID: 32224  
Member ID: 3096  
Date Submitted: Nov 13, 2024, 04:07 PM

**Q1 Full name**

Short Text Brian Hasell

**Q2 Are you are making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?**

Select Box Individual

**Q3 Please enter the name of the organisation you are submitting on behalf of.**

Short Text

**Q4 What is your connection to Wellington?**

Multi Choice I am a Wellington City Council ratepayer

**Q5 Optional: Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an oral hearing?**

Select Box Yes

**Q6 Please leave a phone number for us to arrange the oral hearing time with you.**

Number 274907960

**Q7 Please choose your preferred City to Sea Bridge scenario.**

Select Box I do not support either option

**Q8 If people want a new bridge, there are many things to think about when designing it. Whether you support building a bridge or not, we want to know what the most important things to consider are. Please choose up to three from the list below.**

Multi Choice

Ensuring it's easy for everyone to use (accessibility)  
Adding public art and sculptures  
Including viewing areas  
Adding places to sit and gather

**Q9 You chose 'Keeping the cost low and minimising impact on rates'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q10 You chose 'Ensuring resilience and longevity'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q11 You chose 'Ensuring it's easy for everyone to use (accessibility)'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

The existing bridge provide all these ticked areas very well. In particular it provides a large area for small crowds of visitors to view the magnificent harbour and is the only publicly available site. I bring our overseas visitors there and they are blown away! It is a highlight of their visit.. The alternatives - a ground level crossing or a narrow long bridge do not compare.

**Q12 You chose 'Adding places to sit and gather'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q13 You chose 'Including viewing areas'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q14** You chose 'Adding public art and sculptures'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q15** You chose 'Lighting and safety after dark'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q16** Do you have any other thoughts about the City to Sea Bridge or how people can move between Te Ngākau and the waterfront?

Long Text

I am a Professional Civil Engineer and am concerned about Council having decided to demolish the bridge without public consultation and adequate consideration of the repair option. From the reports available it is clear the Bridge has not been affected in any way by recent earthquakes including the Kaikoura event. It is however predicted to be affected by a larger event that could cause spreading of its pile foundations on the seaward side and these need to be better connected. This work could be done with one traffic lane blocked off as often is the case along the route. I note that the engineer's advice has been that the "safety risk is very low" at present. They suggest Council could delay any decision on demolition for several years while further advice on the works needed and the cost is obtained. I agree.

**Q17** Below are some potential scenarios for further development in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct. Please choose up to three that are most important to you.

Multi Choice

Keeping and restoring existing buildings  
Keeping or increasing the amount of open or green spaces  
Adding spaces for hospitality, retail and other businesses

**Q18** You chose 'Keeping and restoring existing buildings'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q19** You chose 'Keeping or increasing the amount of open or green spaces'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q20** You chose 'Making open or green spaces better for people to use'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q21** You chose 'Adding spaces for hospitality, retail and other businesses'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q22** You chose 'Keeping overall costs as low as possible'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q23** You chose 'Improving cultural and creative opportunities in the space'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q24** You chose 'Lighting and safety after dark'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q25** If you chose to add something else, please tell us why you added this.

Long Text

It is important to retain our heritage as possible, and make the area a "people place".

**Q26** Below are some other potential design considerations for further development in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct. Please choose up to three that are most important to you.

Multi Choice

Accessibility

**Q27** Do you have any other thoughts about what we should be prioritising in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct?

Long Text

**Q28** If you have any supporting documents, please upload them here.

File Upload

**Q29** If you would like to receive a copy of your submission, please enter your email address below.

Email

Response No:  
1

Contribution ID: 32336

Member ID: 40

Date Submitted: Nov 18, 2024, 11:48 AM

**Q1 Full name**

Short Text John Martin Gray

**Q2 Are you are making this submission as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?**

Select Box Individual

**Q3 Please enter the name of the organisation you are submitting on behalf of.**

Short Text

**Q4 What is your connection to Wellington?**

Multi Choice I am a Wellington City Council ratepayer  
I live in Wellington

**Q5 Optional: Do you wish to speak to Councillors about your submission at an oral hearing?**

Select Box Yes

**Q6 Please leave a phone number for us to arrange the oral hearing time with you.**

Number 0

**Q7 Please choose your preferred City to Sea Bridge scenario.**

Select Box I do not support either option

**Q8 If people want a new bridge, there are many things to think about when designing it. Whether you support building a bridge or not, we want to know what the most important things to consider are. Please choose up to three from the list below.**

Multi Choice

**Q9 You chose 'Keeping the cost low and minimising impact on rates'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q10 You chose 'Ensuring resilience and longevity'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q11 You chose 'Ensuring it's easy for everyone to use (accessibility)'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q12 You chose 'Adding places to sit and gather'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q13 You chose 'Including viewing areas'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q14 You chose 'Adding public art and sculptures'. Please tell us why you chose this area.**

Long Text

**Q15** You chose 'Lighting and safety after dark'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q16** Do you have any other thoughts about the City to Sea Bridge or how people can move between Te Ngākau and the waterfront?

Long Text

All these things are relevant and important on ANY design project. It is not appropriate to abstractly rank them in importance. In any case what is to be made of a person ticking lighting and safety after dark. FLOODLIGHTS? NO TREES?

The bridge is of significant value and importance to Wellington and the country: it has iconic status, being synonymous with "Wellington" for locals and visitors alike; together with the square it is a bicultural space of the highest order, with artworks by Maori artists at the height of their careers telling stories of arrival by all peoples to this land from the sea. The bridge is arguably the best bi-cultural urban space in the country. Its strategic location between city and sea offers pedestrians a unique vantage point from which to view the harbour, hills beyond, waterfront and (looking the other way) the square and the city beyond. At a more pragmatic level, it provides a safe and pleasant route between waterfront and city, places to rest, linger, eat lunch, meet others. In every way the bridge is a better way for people to move between the two major urban realms of the city - the waterfront and the square. The bridge, the nikao ramp and the square are each part of an integrated urban composition. KEEP THE BRIDGE, KEEP THE RAMP KEEP THE SQUARE.

**Q17** Below are some potential scenarios for further development in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct. Please choose up to three that are most important to you.

Multi Choice

**Q18** You chose 'Keeping and restoring existing buildings'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q19** You chose 'Keeping or increasing the amount of open or green spaces'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q20** You chose 'Making open or green spaces better for people to use'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q21** You chose 'Adding spaces for hospitality, retail and other businesses'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q22** You chose 'Keeping overall costs as low as possible'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q23** You chose 'Improving cultural and creative opportunities in the space'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q24** You chose 'Lighting and safety after dark'. Please tell us why you chose this area.

Long Text

**Q25** If you chose to add something else, please tell us why you added this.

Long Text

**Q26** Below are some other potential design considerations for further development in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct. Please choose up to three that are most important to you.

Multi Choice

**Q27** Do you have any other thoughts about what we should be prioritising in Te Ngākau Civic Precinct?

Long Text

I can find nothing to recommend the proposed Te Ngākau "development". Firstly, there is no square, only a wide undifferentiated swathe of pavement with random islands of trees, from one end at the Mercer Street portal, to the

four-lane road at Jervois Quay. The roadway carries 17000 vehicle movements a day. It's noisy, visually intrusive and polluting. And it's dangerous - every 10 days somewhere in NZ a pedestrian is killed, the most recent one in Wellington due to a driver running a red light on Cable Street. No young child is playing ball is safe in the vicinity of this road. This is no way to do a civic centre. I urge Council to pause, take a long breath, and properly consider this economically viable option: KEEP THE SQUARE, THE RAMP AND THE CITY TO SEA BRIDGE

**Q28** If you have any supporting documents, please upload them here.

File Upload

**Q29** If you would like to receive a copy of your submission, please enter your email address below.

Email

13 November 2024

Property Team  
Wellington City Council  
PO Box 2199  
Wellington 6140

Email: [tengakau@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:tengakau@wcc.govt.nz)

Dear Sir/Madam

This submission responds to the *Draft Te Ngākau Precinct Development Plan Consultation (the Consultation Paper<sup>1</sup>)*. It focuses in particular on the City to Sea Bridge (**the Bridge**) but also comments on the Michael Fowler Centre which between them “invite life to the area during the day and night”<sup>2</sup>.

DO NOT demolish the Bridge.

I agree with others about having a strong connection to it and that demolition would be an act of vandalism. I therefore do not agree with any of the options presented the Consultation Paper which are predicated on demolition of the Bridge.

The Bridge is an iconic part of the city’s heritage and is so much more than just a road crossing. Its design and construction was an important collaboration between a Māori artist (Para Matchitt), urban designers, architects (Rewi Thompson and John Gray) and city planners. It has both a functional (providing access between the city and the sea) and cultural purpose (iconography of welcoming visitors from the ocean, the celestial navigation applied by Māori, the harbour creation beliefs) all of which are unique not only to Wellington, but also New Zealand and the world.

Its demolition is contrary to the intention of a city of creativity.

Its demolition has been packaged with Capital E perhaps because some of the land both are on is shared. However, the Bridge is not, in fact integral to Capital E. The Bridge’s connection is primarily a pile that runs through Capital E. Several options could include decommissioning Capital E and filling it with sand or, as the Consultation Paper suggests<sup>3</sup>, removing it. To say that not one of the seawall, the Bridge and Capital E “...could not be strengthened without strengthening all three structures”<sup>4</sup> is not true if the seawall and replacement bridge close by is envisaged. Combining costs for any work to the Bridge and Capital E is misleading and the two should be decoupled. The impracticality of closing lanes for construction or reconstruction is a red herring – we have already experienced that with Tākina.

---

<sup>1</sup> – [https://hdp-au-prod-app-wecc-letstalk-files.s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/5717/2965/3030/CB00746-TeNgakauPrecinctDevPlanConsult-Document-FA-DIGITAL\\_1.pdf](https://hdp-au-prod-app-wecc-letstalk-files.s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/5717/2965/3030/CB00746-TeNgakauPrecinctDevPlanConsult-Document-FA-DIGITAL_1.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> p8 Consultation Paper

<sup>3</sup> p12 Consultation Paper

<sup>4</sup> p13 Consultation Paper



The Bridge draws people up to an expansive view of the harbour where many stop to admire and enjoy the view. It is also a meeting place where people gather to sit and talk, to eat their lunch, or to just sit quietly and reflect. It is a living piece of art that connects people, as well as the city to the sea.

Demolishing a major artwork that is accessible and functional for all is the way of dictatorships, and the burning of books, not democracy. It is a beautiful balance of form and function. Placing bits of the artwork all over the place is like putting the London Tower bridge in a desert – and that really did not work.

The Bridge is a focal point for tourists (from its height can be seen the further waterfront and Te Papa)

The earthquakes experienced since the City to Sea Bridge was built have not impacted the Bridge. If the seawall is an issue, then as it supports Jervois Quay, demolishing the Bridge would do nothing to address this issue. If we can fund a kilometres long seawall for a cycle path and railway track that is open to the open sea, then we can surely address the seawall of a lagoon. The seawall to Petone is also reclaimed land so the two are comparable.

The basic fact is that if there was an earthquake of sufficient strength to damage or demolish the City to Sea Bridge, no one would be using Jervois Quay because many other buildings on the Quays will also have collapsed. The Bridge would be the simplest to clear. It is also the case that the bulk (all?) of the land traversed by the Quays is reclaimed and many buildings have been damaged by earthquakes – but not the Bridge.

It is puzzling to know who in Council is championing demolition of the Bridge (and the Michael Fowler Centre) except as a land grab. The opening of the Consultation Paper states that the Te Ngākau Civic Square precinct is a large area of approximately 3.36 hectares near the waterfront, clearly valuable real estate. According to the Decision map in the Consultation Paper<sup>5</sup>, the Bridge decision involves the next largest area of the civic precinct. Already, chunks of the precinct have been sold/leased to commercial interests. Selling the assets of the city deprives future generations of the vision for Wellington as a multicultural capital of the country. Scenario 3 confirms the commercial interests<sup>6</sup>. I strongly oppose demolition and sell off to commercial interests of this area. However, restoring the Michael Fowler Centre need not remove the opportunity for the Jack Ilott Green to be commercially developed.

I wish to address Council on the matter of the future of the City to Sea Bridge as part of the draft development plan when the opportunity is available.

Yours sincerely



Carole Inkster

---

<sup>5</sup> p5 Consultation Paper

<sup>6</sup> p22 Consultation Paper